

STATE OF UTAH

2000-01 CONSOLIDATED PLAN SUMMARY

I. INTRODUCTION

The beginning of a new century and the initiation of a new 5 year planning horizon is an opportune time to evaluate what has gone on over the last 5 years, but more importantly to carefully plan for what we need and how we are going to get it over the next 5 years. Creating a vision of this ideal will help direct our strategy to accomplish that vision by end of this period with regard to the expenditure of scarce public funds both federal and state. The HUD funds are one piece of a much larger puzzle that local governments are trying to fit together to incrementally improve the quality of life for its citizens. The outputs of this consolidated planning process are finally having an effect generally across the state with local governments and with other funding sources including the PCIB (Community Impact Board). The Rural Development programs and other state funding programs (mostly Department of Environmental Quality) are getting involved to a lesser but in an increasing way. A major goal in the next 5 years is to fully integrate HUD funding with the other federal and state programs vital to the small cities of the state. We will work to have these other agencies use the priorities and data contained in the consolidated plan so that duplication can be avoided and more importantly, maximizing the use of these financial resources assured that we are meeting the highest priority community needs in an efficient manner.

The State of Utah is presenting this document as a 5 year rewrite of the Consolidated Plan. It sets forth the vision for that period and it identifies how the vision will be accomplished through 1-year action plans starting in 2000. New in the plan from the previous editions is the housing section that was written by the housing staff themselves so that it will be compliant with the priorities of the Olene Walker Housing Trust Fund. The Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing section has been updated. The "rural continuum of care" has been modified to demonstrate the collaboration process. Both the CD and ED sections have been updated and amended to represent very faithfully regional priorities. It is assured thereby that expenditures of public funds will be done based on a strategic planning process and locally driven priorities are being addressed. There is regional variation in terms of planning approaches and priorities and this is healthy in that different areas of the state have distinctly different problems and methods to resolve them. Some regions are much further along in their planning strategies than others and the quality of projects shows in those regions who have really put forth the effort to seriously plan for community development using the consolidated plan as a guide. We have seen some dramatic improvements especially in the Uintah Basin Region.

To prepare for this new 5 year plan each of the seven regions of the state has completed its own consolidated plan based on a general outline and content requirement established by the state. This concept initiated 5 years ago, has resulted in impressive yearly improvements in the quality of the plans presented especially with regard to the involvement of each individual community and county in a meaningful way. Every community in the non-entitlement area of the state has developed a capital improvement plan and is beginning to think strategically. Some have recently completed their first one in combination with an affordable housing plan. All communities now have access to local technical assistance from the state and the regions. The data on which some of these plans were prepared in now dated, but does represent the needs of the communities quite accurately. This process will continue to evolve over time and by the end of the next 5 year period these plans will be extremely important tools for decision makers. These plans are now being used by the Utah Community Impact Account Board. Our major goal is to implement them in applications for other funding processes as well. This planning is being done on the premise that local governments can and indeed, should, determine their own priorities for the expenditure of scarce public funds within a solid planning framework, with high quality data and with appropriate technical assistance. The state provides on-going financial assistance to these agencies to do research, planning and public services on behalf of local governments in their region. The Consolidated Plan of the State of Utah is a compilation of these regional plans forming a statewide policy that establishes priorities generally consistent with local priorities from

throughout the state.

The role of the State of Utah is to guide/train local government officials as well as non-profits in developing adequate planning capabilities and to assist low or moderate income populations financially when local government can not come up with all the necessary funding to perpetuate planning functions in an ever more efficient manner throughout the state. The state has and will continue to develop statewide goals and objectives based on common issues in support of local government. There continues to be common problems identified across the state. Through improved determination of need and related prioritization of problems, it is hoped that the state in partnership with local government, can overall, provide solutions to problems, which are very significant to both. The state will also begin to facilitate improved communication and coordination between the state, other federal and state agencies and local governments to bring about comprehensive solutions to these community issues.

A. COMPREHENSIVE VISION AND ACTION PLAN

The Community Development Block Grant Program and the HOME program funds as well as the ESG and HOPWA programs are administered by board or committees made up of persons of diverse back- grounds and interests. The CDBG Policy Committee, created by governor's executive order, manages the CDBG program. It is made up of 7 elected officials, one from each of the 7 regions of the state. The Olene Walker Housing Trust Fund board that is statutory distributes the HOME funds. The Homeless Trust Fund Board administers the ESG and HOPWA programs. Each of these programs utilize a different method of distribution.

Method of Distribution

CDBG Program

The CDBG Policy Committee has long held that program decision-making should be made as close to the applicant level as possible. On this basis each of the 7 regional planning agencies or associations of governments have been delegated the responsibility to create and apply a rating and ranking process. The process must utilize several state mandated components but can also include a number of local priorities. Each of the rating and ranking criteria's are approved by the state prior to being applied. Also the state reviews all of the results of the rating and ranking processes for consistency and fairness. Each of the rating and ranking systems used by the regions are included in the appendices attached at the end of this document with the executive summary of their region's Consolidated Plan. One of the rating and ranking criteria is consistency with the Consolidated Plan.

HOME Program

The HOME Program is administered in 2 sections, the Multiple Family Program and the Single Family Program. The Olene Walker Housing Trust Fund Board manages the Multiple Family Program. This board meets quarterly to review and approve projects. The board is made up of bankers, providers, At this writing the criteria for selection is being redeveloped and the process for applying is being modified. The criteria being developed will better serve the intent of the program and the interests of the clients. The criteria are designed to meet the federal intent and the objectives of the state statute.

The Single Family Loan Review Committee manages the single-family program. Blocks of funding are given to each of 8 eligible non-profit agencies. These agencies develop selection criterion that are applied to projects submitted by families and individuals. The procedure is pre-approved by the state prior to its use. The state then approves projects which have been prioritized and then issues contracts for each project.

ESG and HOPWA Programs

These programs are administered by the Homeless Coordinating Committee. All applications are selected based on priorities established by the committee. This committee also meets quarterly.

PRIORITY USES OF FUNDS

The State of Utah will use all of its 2000 CDBG allocation of approximately \$7,500,000 in meeting the highest community development, housing and economic development needs. Infrastructure, specifically water development, will continue to be the highest need in the state. Public service uses and housing are rapidly increasing in importance. We will allow communities to select the projects for which they will apply based on their own priorities included in this plan. Appropriate expenditures of CDBG funds will be diverse because of program flexibility. The expenditure of HOME funds (\$3,000,000) will be subject to the housing priorities contained in this plan that also have extensive local input. The priorities for ESG funds come out of local planning which is consistent with the state homeless plan contained herein. The state HOPWA priorities come from some local assessments and from DCD data analysis. However, applicants should all understand the more general nature of particularly the CDBG program and that if housing needs are rated as a significant need they should have no hesitation to apply for CDBG funds to complete the project either separately or to use CDBG to augment HOME or other resources already in place. Housing projects rank very well in most regional prioritization processes. CDBG funds may be used to extend housing benefits to more families directly. Local government officials should recognize the magnitude of the affordable housing crisis in the state. Local governments are in the process of prioritizing the problems facing the community but they then must translate those priorities into applications to address those needs. It has been apparent in the past that most communities prepare applications based on doing projects that will fit the program requirements the easiest and are not based on the importance of the need. While it is true that projects must fit the program requirements, communities should not be intimidated by program requirements and apply for those projects that are critically needed and with help from regions and the state, the project can be completed successfully regardless of the various requirements placed on it.

HOME and ESG program funds will be used in concert with other state programs primarily the Olene Walker Housing Trust Fund, and the Homeless Trust Fund. Both of these programs are partially funded by the Utah State Legislature. The funds will be used for a variety of different kinds of housing but subject to the priorities listed herein. Primarily the funds will be used for single family rehabilitation, single family replacement, homebuyer down-payment assistance programs, and multi-family projects which address the housing needs of the increasing number of homeless persons.

Single-family rehabilitation will also be an important component of our program. Projects will also be considered which address the housing needs of the increasing number of homeless persons. Some limited funding will be spent on low income home buyer programs.

B. CITIZEN PARTICIPATION

From the very beginning of this consolidated planning process it was the intention of the State of Utah to involve citizens at all levels of the process. This goal continues to be met through a variety of different programs by each region and the state. Evaluation of the public participation programs of the regions have been made and changes implemented as applicable. Public involvement continues to evolve and improve. In this day and age of very important public forums, the 2002 Olympic Games, Envision Utah (a comprehensive planning initiative), local zoning issues, and all of the negative publicity coming out of government generally, it is very difficult to interest the public in getting involved in long term planning, but it is happening to varying degrees. New plans for public involvement included the development of strategic, working committees as well as scoping meetings and the use of surveys. Often the common forums, workshops and hearings can still be effective. Advertising of these events has been enhanced. The involvement of the press in on-going education of the public concerning the various programs has been improved and will be ongoing indefinitely.

We continue to feel that involvement of the public at the local level will be the most effective way to involve people. The regions are, of course, expected to prepare a consolidated plan reflective of the needs of the many people, agencies, cities, towns and counties. The use of web sites is increasing as information technology slowly migrates to the most rural areas of the state. We will continue to increase the use of newspapers and radio stations to do public education not just public notification. The state has and will continue to improve distribution of information to interested non-profit agencies. The state has its own hearing processes. The CDBG Policy Committee and the Olene Walker Housing Trust Fund Board, as well as various other committees will work to let people know what is going on with the program and to seek involvement. We will work to further improve the notoriety of the program through the Community Development Week activities. We will also be continually working with any new task forces created by the Utah State Legislature. Literally, the public has access to one 30 day comment period for the state document and at least 210 days of comment periods at the regional levels. There will be at least 9 public hearings held during the comment periods, as well.

Bear River Region: The holding of a "Poverty Forum" is now an annual activity all persons can count on and participate in. This activity has become a very important component of the regions efforts to bring together groups and individuals to discuss solutions to poverty issues and specifically the plans of the region to address the issues. They also discuss the consolidated plan and its contents as a way of identifying issues. Responsiveness to the needs addressed in the forum is critical in order to receive this kind of continued involvement. Input was obtained on goals and strategies as well as low income issues generally. It is hoped that interest will continue to increase over time. Efforts should increase to make sure as many people as possible are made aware of this process. One 30 day comment period advertised in all three counties in newspapers and posting was available and a public hearing was held.

Wasatch Front Region: The WFRC has completed its best consolidated plan to date for the 2000 5-year plan. This year the plans have formed the basis of renewed public involvement and this evolution will continue. Citizens now have plans and priorities to which they can respond. There was some public participation in the collection of data and formulation of policies and solutions. Each of the counties in this region held a 30 day comment period to obtain direction and input. Drafts of the plans were sent to all local jurisdictions as well as non-profit agencies. There was local press coverage in terms of articles about the plans and the planning process.

Mountainland Region: A 30 day comment period was provided along with three public hearings. A significant amount of time went into the preparation of the new consolidated plan for this region and therefore the basic public involvement took place on significant, current issues. Specific notices of the comment period and the hearing were sent out to a broad group of individuals and organizations.

Uintah Basin Region: This region relied on public hearings and comment periods. The innovative regional advisory committee made up of individuals from all of the communities and counties within their region was recreated and became the foundation for the public involvement program in the region. The plan is completely rewritten and the public will be favorably impressed with the content of the plan and how it relates to them.

Six-County Region: It was decided by this region that in the first year of the consolidated plan a survey would be the best way to obtain public input. It has been perpetuated and amended and now the standard is for the region to meet specifically with each city/town and county in their region and conduct an updated survey, in preparation for adopting the plan. This process was followed year 2000 plan. Input has been collected from the public at large as well as organizations interested in community development issues. All meetings with jurisdictions were advertised publicly and the forums held were open to public attendance and input. In addition, a 30 day comment period was provided. Other ideas will continue to be evaluated along with the traditional methodologies used.

Southeastern Region: In 2000, the southeastern part of the state held training seminars with any interested persons on the plan and on affordable housing. Coordinating bodies were also created with housing authorities and other low income advocacy groups. Meetings were held and input received and included in the plan. They have used multiple means to involve the public in this process. Hopefully, lessons learned in this process can be extended to other regions. A 30 day comment period and a public hearing was held as well.

Five County Region: Many agencies and individuals (42) participated in the formulation of FCAOG's plan through the use of a committee made up of interests from a variety of perspectives. Multiple scoping meetings have been held in the past, specific to economic development, housing and community development (CD). They will also have a 30 day comment period and at least 2 public hearings. New ideas will be explored in this region and a new program developed in 2000.

In summary, Utah citizens have had many opportunities to get involved in the consolidated planning process in the past and they will continue to have this opportunity in the future. However, in the future new and creative ideas will be developed to make it even easier than it has been in the past. There will continue to be hundreds of public comment days and multiple public hearings held. Hundreds of copies of draft documents and executive summaries were and will continue to be sent out to individuals and agencies. We feel comfortable that this plan has and will continue to receive wide coverage throughout the state and many opportunities for input from anyone even remotely interested in the plan. The creation of capital investment plans in each county and city will also be a process where many people can be involved.

II. STATE PROFILE

Based on the most current State of Utah population estimates published in January of 1998, the State of Utah currently has a population of 2,135,226 and is growing about 2% per year. In 1998, the growth rate slowed somewhat as compared to the last 3 or 4 years. This consolidated plan covers the non-entitlement areas of the state. The cities of Salt Lake, West Valley, West Jordan, Taylorsville and Sandy as well as Salt Lake County itself are excluded from this plan. The states newest HUD entitlement is Layton City in Davis County with a population of 52,743. The population served by this plan is 925,591 based on current estimates. Other entitlement communities include Ogden City (66,402) in Weber County, Provo City (101,426) and Orem City (81,499), are excluded, as is Clearfield City (22,720), in Davis County, under a special designation. The HOME and ESG components serve a larger amount due to the expanded eligibility of consortiums and participating jurisdictions.

The state of Utah population is made up of 9% minority populations living primarily along the western edge of the Wasatch Mountains (Salt Lake, Utah, Davis and Weber Counties). The largest minority in the state is Hispanic (5%) followed by Asian (2%), Native American (1.5%) and African American (.5%). There is an increasing number of persons coming from the Pacific Islands as well. There are two large reservations in the state where a majority of Native Americans live. They are in the northeastern area of the state (Uintah Basin), the Uintah-Ouray. The Navaho Reservation, in extreme southeastern Utah, is primarily in Arizona with the northern extension in Utah. There are other smaller reservations primarily in western Utah.

The income characteristics of the state show lower per-capita income (\$9,791) than other states in the west due primarily to an extremely high birth rate and a large number of persons in the younger age classifications. There is approximately half of the population living in the State of Utah which are classified as low or moderate income. There are a significant number of people underemployed due to the service nature of many of the jobs available in the state and the economic dependance on the tourism industry. The state enjoys a very low unemployment rate usually below 4% with not all regions participating in this prosperity. Many of the jobs however are lower paying without much opportunity for advancement. The state has a very high rate of graduation from high school and a higher than normal number of persons with advanced college degrees. An atypical percentage of minority persons are in the lower income categories and due to that lower income, a higher percentage of inadequate housing is experienced by non-white persons. There are approximately 44,000 housing units in the non-entitlement areas of the state in need of significant rehabilitation which are occupied by persons with incomes 30% of median. Many of these families are minorities and many older homes are occupied by elderly single female heads of households..

The State of Utah has been in a rapid growth period. While growth continues to occur it has slowed and growth from within continues to be the primary growth source. Utah has the highest percent of population within the childbearing ages than any state in the union. There continues to be in-migration from areas around the western and central parts of the country. The migration from California has slowed. In this situation it is very easy to lose track of the lower income persons and families. Careful planning needs to be perpetuated to insure that these persons are brought into the planning and equally share in the implementation processes. Provisions for job enhancement and training, education opportunities, housing choice and assistance and infrastructure improvement must be part of any consolidated planning analysis for all persons regardless of income or race.